

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and following remarks, further examination and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

The specification and the abstract of the invention have been carefully reviewed and revised to make grammatical and idiomatic improvements in order to aid the Examiner in further consideration of the application. No new matter has been added. Also attached hereto is a marked-up version of the changes made to the specification and the abstract by the current amendment. The attachment is captioned **"Version with Markings to Show Changes Made."**

Claims 2, 4-7, 10, 13-20, 23-29, and 31-35 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter contained therein. New claims 36 and 37 are added.

In item 1 of the Office Action of July 3, 2008, the abstract of the disclosure is objected to. The abstract of the disclosure has been amended to address the specific issues raised in the objection, and to fully comply with MPEP § 608.01(b). Thus, this objection is no longer applicable to the abstract, and the withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

In item 2 of the Office Action, claims 1, 5, and 23 are rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. This rejection is moot with respect to claims 5 and 23 in view of their cancellation. Claim 1 has been amended to clarify the language. Thus, this rejection is now inapplicable to the claims, and the withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

In item 5 of the Office Action, claims 1, 9-13, 15-21, 23-25, and 31-35 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Verhaverbeke et al. (US 2002/0066475). This rejection is moot with respect to claims 10, 13, 15-20, and 23-25 in view of their cancellation. The rejection is traversed and inapplicable to amended claims 1, 9, 11, 12, and 21 for the reasons below, and the withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 9 recite a substrate processing apparatus and method, respectively, having a substrate rotation mechanism configured to increase or decrease a rotational speed of substrate holding mechanisms so as to cause rotational slipping of a substrate relative to the substrate

holding mechanisms. This is not disclosed in any of the prior art of record.

Verhaverbeke is cited in the Action as disclosing such a substrate rotation mechanism in paragraph 36; this assertion is respectfully traversed. There is no disclosure in paragraph 36, or elsewhere in Verhaverbeke, that the substrate rotation mechanism is configured to increase or decrease a rotational speed of a substrate holding mechanism *so as to cause rotational slipping of a substrate relative to the substrate holding mechanism*. The rotational slipping recited in claim 1 allows the portions of the substrate at which the substrate is held to be changed (page 16 of the specification, first paragraph) during processing of the substrate.

Thus, the present invention as recited in claims 1 and 9 is not anticipated by Verhaverbeke. The shortcomings of Verhaverbeke are not obviated by any of the prior art of record, and no obvious interpretation of Verhaverbeke would have resulted in the present invention. Thus, claims 1 and 9 are clearly allowable over the prior art of record, as are claims 11, 12, and 21 depending therefrom.

In item 9 of the Office Action, claims 3-5, 7, 14, and 27 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Verhaverbeke. This rejection is moot with respect to claims 4, 5, 7, 14, and 27 in view of their cancellation. This rejection is inapplicable to amended claim 3 for the reasons below, and thus the withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 3 recites a substrate processing apparatus having a first liquid supply nozzle for selectively supplying a chemical liquid or a first cleaning liquid to the substrate through a first line, a second liquid supply nozzle for supplying a second cleaning liquid to an inner surface of the substrate holding mechanism and an upper surface of the base member through a second line, a first liquid discharge mechanism for discharging a liquid in the first line to a drain without supplying the liquid to the substrate, and a second liquid discharge mechanism for discharging a liquid in the second line to a drain without supplying the liquid to the substrate. Such first and second liquid discharge mechanisms are not disclosed in the prior art of record.

The first and second liquid discharge mechanisms for discharging liquids in the first and second lines, respectively, to a drain *without supplying the liquids to the substrate* are not disclosed in Verhaverbeke, inherently or otherwise. For example, the liquid discharge

mechanism asserted to be inherent in Verhaverbeke on page 10 of the Action only discharges onto the substrate. The other prior art of record does not disclose such liquid discharge mechanisms, nor was it cited for such in the Action.

So, the shortcomings of Verhaverbeke are not obviated by any of the prior art of record, and no obvious interpretation of Verhaverbeke would have resulted in the present invention as recited in claim 3. Thus, claim 3 is clearly allowable over the prior art of record, as are claims 36 and 37 depending therefrom.

In item 10 of the Office Action, claims 8 and 28-30 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Verhaverbeke and further in view of Rodney Chiu et al. (US 2003/0183250). This rejection is moot with respect to claims 28 and 29 in view of their cancellation. This rejection is believed inapplicable to claims 8 and 30. Claims 8 and 30 depend from claims 1 and 3, respectively, which are not disclosed or rendered obvious by the prior art of record for the reasons discussed above. Thus, claims 8 and 30 are clearly allowable over the prior art of record, and the withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

In item 11 of the Office Action, claim 22 is rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Verhaverbeke, as evidenced by Yamamoto et al. (US 5,898,720). Claim 22 depends from claim 9 which is not disclosed or rendered obvious by the prior art of record for the reasons discussed above. Thus, claim 22 is clearly allowable over the prior art of record, and the withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is clearly in condition for allowance. An early notice thereof is earnestly solicited.

If, after reviewing this Amendment, the Examiner feels there are any issues remaining which must be resolved before the application can be passed to issue, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned by telephone in order to resolve such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Shinji KAJITA et al.

By:



Aldo A. D'Ottavio
Registration No. 59,559
Agent for Applicants

AAD/JRF
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
October 3, 2008